

November 23, 1972

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000400100008-3

than these four and one lady. But this protest of mine is against the system, not the people involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope that the Senator does not infer that my question is based on any suspicion about any Member.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator wants to raise that issue let me say that I have the greatest respect for the Senator from Louisiana and I am willing to turn the whole Senate over to him and go home because he has the experience. I am as fond of him as I am of any man in public life. That is not the question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Louisiana is a Member of this body and has been for a long time, and I am sure he does not take the position he should pass on all issues that come here because he has had long experience. That is not the system. I do not understand why the overall amount for these activities has to be secret.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Neither do I.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a very bad practice because it casts doubt on this whole appropriation. When you look at an item in this bill you wonder if it is really the amount of money for the A-14, for example, or if it is for the NSA. One cannot tell what it is.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the able Senator from California.

Mr. CRANSTON. Are there references in the appropriation bill to funds for intelligence uses?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No.

Mr. CRANSTON. How are they provided for; by padding other categories?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am not sure I have enough knowledge to answer. Presumably yes.

Mr. CRANSTON. What is the Senator's answer on what is provided to the intelligence community?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have heard so many varying facts that is another primary reason I introduced the amendment.

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator has no estimate?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have no estimate that in any way could be considered remotely accurate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Do I understand that the purpose of the amendment is that as these appropriations or the money spent in these intelligence functions are not known and are not directly authorized or appropriated by Congress and the Senate, that the Senator wants to make it a matter of precedent and right that the Senate and Congress should actually authorize and appropriate these funds?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. As a matter of right, I believe there are certain committees, the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, that should know in

executive session about the authorization and appropriation of moneys in this intelligence category.

Mr. COOPER. I would make one comment.

It is always a matter that is troublesome because it could involve security, but it is a fact we learned during the last several years that without the knowledge of Congress our country has become involved in pressures that led to a long and costly war.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is so right. That is one of the primary reasons for my amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Missouri saw fit to introduce this amendment. Of course, I am opposing it.

I have been in the Senate for 35 years. I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for about 22 or 23 years. Ever since I have been on that committee, all the appropriations affecting our sensitive intelligence program have been handled by only a few Members of the Senate and a few Members of the House. Twenty years ago we started out with two Members. That number has been increased to five, who are chosen from the Committee on Appropriations. That has been the method that has been followed all these years.

I would hesitate to have these programs submitted to the committee of the whole because of the highly sensitive nature of the material that come before us. In order to justify the amounts asked, we are told the reasons why it is needed.

My fear is that if this material were made widely available, we would do harm to our own intelligence operations. Of course these intelligence operations are a very important part of our overall defense.

I do not understand the extent of the amendment of my good friend from Missouri. The amendment reads:

The Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the Defense Intelligence Agency, and for intelligence work performed by or on behalf of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force.

Well, of course, much of the intelligence gathered, whether it be tactical or not, is gathered either by the CIA or the Defense Department.

This method of appropriating funds for these intelligence activities has been in effect for at least 20 years that I know of, since I have been on the committee. We five who sit on this committee hear the testimony of those applying for funds. The funds are justified to us. We ask many questions. None of this information is in writing, nor is it recorded, but it is simply given to us, and we weigh it and then recommend appropriations as is seen fitting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 minutes more.

There is no specific appropriation for the intelligence activities. They are

funded from many different appropriations included in the bill.

Mr. President, as I said, this is a rather ticklish subject. It is a subject that I do not care to discuss in the open. I believe that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and, as a matter of fact, any other Senator on the committee who desires to be briefed by the Defense Department or by the Central Intelligence Agency may be briefed. We request it at times. There is nothing to stop the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) or the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) from calling Mr. Helms before the committee to give them an idea of what he is doing. But this matter of justifying the amount of money asked in order to carry on intelligence has been for years confined to a few people, because of the sensitivity of the subject. I am very hopeful that that method can be continued.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. In 1 minute.

When I first became one of the five, I attended these hearings. The late Senator Russell was then chairman of the committee. I attended the hearings and took a good deal of interest in them. After hearing both the Defense Intelligence as well as the CIA requests, I thought that there was somewhat more money asked for than needed. So my first effort as a member of the five was to reduce the number of people engaged in intelligence. As I recall, we asked that the number of persons engaged in certain intelligence activities be reduced by 5,000, and that was done.

Mr. President, I wish to say that this year, instead of trying to reduce the number of persons, we actually reduced the amount of money requested.

I wish to point out that I have discussed this matter with Mr. MAHON, who is chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. We discussed together what ought to be done to reduce the amount of money that was requested for intelligence. I gave him a few ideas of what I proposed to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 3 more minutes.

I wish to say that he not only listened to me, but adopted some of the ideas I gave him. So the House reduced the intelligence request by \$320 million, and the Senate committee reduced the amount by \$70 million more, making a total reduction for this year in the amount asked of \$390 million.

I think that is a substantial reduction in our intelligence. I want to pledge to the Senate that as a member of the five, I shall continue to look more deeply into this matter, in the hope of being able to cut back a good deal more than the cut made this year.

These cuts were made by our committee and by the House after careful hearings of Defense Intelligence as well as the CIA. I would hesitate to suggest that more Senators and more Members of the House be involved in this sensitive work.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

November 23, 1971

S 19527

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This intelligence covers a lot more than intelligence gathering. Does it not also cover, for example, the cost of the organization of the war in Laos, supported by the CIA? Would that not be included in this same amount of money? It is financed through the CIA. This is no secret. It has been published.

Mr. ELLENDER. I saw it publicized—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps the Senator does not agree to it, but it has been published. But suppose, as a hypothetical case, that it is carried on by the CIA. Would not that operation be carried in this amount?

Mr. ELLENDER. For that activity?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, for the manpower. It has been stated that the CIA has 36,000 there. It is no secret. Would the Senator say that before the creation of the army in Laos they came before the committee and the committee knew of it and approved it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Probably so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator approve it?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was not—I did not know anything about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So the whole idea of Congress declaring war is really circumvented by such a procedure, is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, Mr. President, I wish to say that—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I do not think so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, if you can create an army and support it through the CIA, without anyone knowing about it, I do not know why it is not. That is a hypothetical question I am asking.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. But, Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not know. I never asked, to begin with, whether or not there were any funds to carry on the war in this sum the CIA asked for. It never dawned on me to ask about it. I did see it publicized in the newspapers some time ago.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, this has been publicized often. But the CIA has many large operations. They operated a revolution in Guatemala some years ago, and threw out the government. But does not the Senator think Congress ought to know?

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, let Congress change the rules, if it so desires. Let Congress designate more than the five we have. But I would like to see it proceed in an orderly fashion, the same as it has in the past, and if the distinguished Senator from Arkansas—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me ask, why does the Senator seem to think it is so necessary to keep secret the operations in Laos, as opposed to Vietnam? We have great publicity on Vietnam; why does the Senator think it has to be secret, the operation in Laos?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is apparently not secret, since the Senator knows about it. I think the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) has sent some investigators out there and secured a lot of information that he made public.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, the newspapers published the information before that. We were alerted when I first read about it in a newspaper

account, and then we sent the people out there to check on it, it was so amazing.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the able chairman will yield, I have never published any information along this line that was not cleared first.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One of the reasons why this committee was created was as a result of reading in the newspapers just such stories, because it was incredible that we were supporting an army of 36,000 and paying for it without knowing about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder if the Senator would give us the reason why this should all be secret.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I have served on this Intelligence Subcommittee on Appropriations for 5 or 6 years, and this is the first time I ever attempted to defend what the CIA or any intelligence agency does. In order to do it, you would have to document your case, and one cannot document intelligence and spying. Spying is a dirty business, but it is a business every nation in the world engages in. Russia does a bigger job of it than we do. You cannot disclose secret information. But it is very valuable to us. It was very valuable to know, when we had the showdown with Cuba, just what the Russians would and would not do.

This five-member committee was not publicized or listed until about 3 or 4 years ago. The House of Representatives does not list their names yet.

You always have to have some secrecy in Government. For example, when the atomic bomb was developed, if there had been more than 10 people in the House and Senate who knew about that, it would have been public knowledge. But this was one of the best kept secrets in history.

You have all kinds of intelligence. For example, the satellites are intelligence-gathering vehicles. Would a weather satellite be an intelligence-gathering vehicle? It could be a part of military intelligence. That knowledge is very important to them. Does the Symington amendment include this?

As to all these press stories we read and hear, this is an interesting subject to write about, of course. People like to read them. I do, too. And if you want to read something very interesting and authoritative where intelligence is concerned, read the Penkovsky papers. Penkovsky was a Russian spy who became very disillusioned with the Russian Government, and told us all he knew about Russian intelligence, and he was caught. He knew he was going to be caught eventually, and he was caught and killed.

But this is a very interesting story, on why the intelligence we had in Cuba was so important to us, and on what the Russians were thinking and just how far they would go. For the life of me, I cannot understand what the amount of money we spend for intelligence would have to do with the Committees on Foreign Re-

What the Senator is interested in is

intelligence. So far as I am concerned, there is no objection to that committee from whatever intelligence they are able to get.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I am not interested in the spies and their mistresses, and the Goldfinger type of thing. But here is a vast amount of money. I gave one illustration. Does not the Senator think it is our responsibility to know about the kind of activity in Laos, which I am quite certain is going on? In fact, I know it. But we were first alerted through the newspapers of the army there.

The Senator says it was a tremendous thing to keep the atomic bomb secret. As a matter of fact, suppose it had been known we were making one, what would have been the harm in that? It was not the secrecy that was significant, it was the fact that we succeeded. I do not know why the secrecy was all that important. If they had known we would have it in advance, it is quite possible that we would not have had to drop it. I do not know; that is a speculative matter. But I am not impressed with the argument that it was so important to keep it secret, other than perhaps as far as the technical thing was concerned.

When Roosevelt asked for 50,000 airplanes, everyone knew we were going to build 50,000 airplanes. We did build them, and used them.

But this secrecy and classification has become a god in this country, and those people who have secrets travel in a kind of fraternity like a college secret society, and they will not speak to anyone else. Yet the Senator wants us to appropriate the money and vote for the bill. I want to say that I find it very difficult to vote for a measure as to which I do not know whether the amount involved is \$5 or \$10 billion. When I think about what a poor, second-class Nation we are said to be militarily, although we spend twice as much as the Russians, it occurs to me that it may be \$20 billion, for all I know.

I cannot understand why it is so important to be secret. As the Senator said, we know that the Russians do it, and the Russians know that we do. Everyone knows that we monitor their shots, just like they monitor ours. We all do the same thing. There is no secret about that, except that we do not know what we are spending on it, and how much it is, and we also do not know about the operations that are not intelligence gathering.

It is very unusual that we have an agency called an intelligence agency operating a war. That is like the Pentagon. It is not gathering intelligence in Laos; I submit it is organizing and paying for a war. It is running airlines and paying for them. That is not intelligence gathering at all.

Mr. YOUNG. Is the Senator talking on his time or mine?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I just ask the Senator, why should that be a secret? I really do not know. If we hire citizens of other nations to do in Cambodia what our own people are forbidden to do by law, does the Senator think that is good?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who yields time?